

1992 Master Plan



For the:

Corrections Service Division
Department of Social Services
Government of the Northwest Territories

Prepared for:

Department of Public Works and Highways
Government of the Northwest Territories

August 1992

The Apra Group Inc.

201 - 560 Beatty Street Vancouver, B.C. V6B 2L3 (604) 687-4341

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of the Northwest Territories

The total population of the Northwest Territories is currently 57,649 (Population and Dwelling Counts, Territorial Bureau of Statistics, April 1992), and is composed of 64% natives and 36% non-natives. The population is projected to increase by up to 39% by the year 2006; the proportion of natives is projected to increase to between 66% and 69%, with the Inuit population increasing the most. Families tend to be larger than the Canadian average. Education and employment levels are below the Canadian average. Social problems are endemic throughout the Northwest Territories, particularly poverty, alcohol and substance abuse, and dysfunctional families.

The crime rates are the highest in Canada and as a result there is a disproportionate demand for Corrections services throughout the Northwest Territories. The highest rate of Corrections admissions is in the Inuvik region, followed by Fort Smith region, Baffin region, and Kitikmeot region. Yellowknife area and Keewatin region have relatively low rates of Corrections admissions.

Overview of the Corrections Service Division

The Corrections Service Division is currently part of the Department of Social Services. Some programs and services provided by the Division require close co-operation with the Justice Department. The unique geographical, cultural, and linguistic characteristics combined with the small population and extremely high rates of crime mean that the provision of Corrections services is expensive relative to other jurisdictions. Adult correctional operational expenditures accounted for 1% of total government expenditures in 1989-90, compared with a national average of 0.6%. However, the Yukon, which is the most comparable jurisdiction, spent 1.5% of the the total government budget on adult correctional operational expenditures.

There are three major components to the Corrections Service Division: the headquarters administration, the institutional component, and the community corrections component. The institutional operations tend to be centralized and structured, and the community corrections tend to be more decentralized.

Offender Profiles

Offenders may be sentenced territorially or federally (any sentence of two years or more). Federal offenders (offenders from the Northwest Territories who receive a federal sentence) generally serve their sentence in a federal facility outside the Northwest Territories. This is often inappropriate to their needs. There is an Exchange of Services Agreement between the Government of the Northwest Territories and the federal government which currently allows for the repatriation of 20 federal offenders to the Northwest Territories. It is an objective of the Corrections Service Division to repatriate all federally sentenced offenders.

There are currently approximately 90 federally sentenced offenders from the Northwest Territories. Inuit are the most over-represented ethnic group, comprising 60.4% of all federal offenders from the Northwest Territories. 75% of the federal offenders are sentenced for violent offences, predominantly assault and sexual assault. Almost all offences involve alcohol, and there is frequently a history of alcohol or substance abuse, and a previous criminal record.

For territorially sentenced adult male offenders, the Corrections admission rate has increased 45% over the past decade, which far exceeds the increase in population. 30% of all charges are alcohol related; 15% of offences are assault. Over the past five years sexual assault offences have increased by 21%. The violent crime rate is 5.9 times greater than the Canadian average and this discrepancy has increased over the last decade. The property offence rate is 1.7 times the national average but the discrepancy has not changed. The majority of offenders are under the age of 30. The most common sentence length is between 32 and 89 days. Most offenders are sentenced for property offences, but the proportion sentenced for violent offences is increasing. All native groups are over-represented relative to the

general population. In 1990, 1188 offenders were admitted to correctional facilities, 333 were placed on probation, and 116 received community service orders (Corrections Information System data).

Adult female offenders have a higher proportion (42%) of liquor related charges. Offences against the person are the second most common charge, and account for 15.3% of corrections admissions. 20% of corrections admissions for adult females are for property offences, and the remaining 56.5% are for other criminal offences. There has been no statistically significant increase in the number of female offenders over the past decade. In 1990 a total of 43 females were admitted to corrections facilities, 85 were placed on probation, and 238 received community service orders (Corrections Information System data).

The offence rate for young offenders is much higher than it is for other Canadian jurisdictions. 13.1% of all charges are for violent offences, compared to a national average of 10.9%. The statistical comparisons indicate that the high rate of persons offences is an issue, and that it may increase for female young offenders. For property offences, the rates are approximately the same as the national average for both male and female young offenders. Secure and open custody are both used more than the national average, while non-custodial sanctions are used at a lower rate than other jurisdictions. This may reflect the higher proportion of youth committing violent offences relative to other jurisdictions, or it may reflect a lack of adequate and appropriate non-custodial options. The most common custodial sentence is between four and six months, compared to a national average of three months. In 1990/91 66 youth were sentenced to secure custody, 57 to open custody, and 196 youths were placed on probation (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada. Youth Court Statistics Preliminary Data 1990-91, Table 16).

Correctional Facilities

There are three adult male and one adult female secure correctional facilities and three secure custody facilities for young offenders. Yellowknife Correctional Centre, located in Yellowknife is the largest facility with a design capacity of 132 beds, and an operating capacity of 174 beds. This is

the only facility that provides more than minimum security. Baffin Correctional Centre in Iqaluit has a design capacity of 48 beds, and an operating capacity of 60 offenders; South Mackenzie Correctional Centre in Hay River is designed to accommodate 58 offenders and operates at the design capacity. There are a total of 250 adult male beds; all facilities may hold remand as well as sentenced offenders. The Northwest Territorial Women's Correctional Centre, located in Fort Smith, opened in 1991 and has a capacity for 10 females. River Ridge Youth Custody Centre, also located in Fort Smith, is a maximum security youth custody centre with a capacity of 14 beds for male young offenders. Hay River Youth Custody Centre is currently being renovated to attain a capacity for 16 males and four females. Baffin Youth Custody Centre, also called Isumaqsunngittut in Inuktitut, is located in Iqaluit, and has an official capacity of 12 beds. There are a total of 42 secure custody beds available for young offenders.

Community Corrections

The Community Corrections component of the Corrections Service Division provides all non-institutional corrections services, and all community-based corrections services and programs. These initiatives include diversion and alternative measures programs, parole and probation supervision, Community Service Order and Fine Option programs, contract services such as work camps and open custody beds, and Youth and Community Justice Committees.

There are 12 Community Corrections Specialists positions. The Specialists report to the Area or Regional Superintendents for Social Services, and serve as regional resources for Corrections program and service delivery. There is a Community Corrections Co-ordinator with the Corrections Service Division administration in Yellowknife. All of the Corrections casework is done by the Community Social Service Workers, who also provide all other service delivery for the Department of Social Services.

Needs and Recommendations

NEED #1. There is a need to develop an integrated Justice and Corrections service delivery system.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1a. That the potential role and mandate of the Corrections Service Division within the Department of Justice be reviewed and clarified with respect to all types of corrections service delivery and justice issues.
- 1b. That formal committees and a consultative process be developed to ensure optimum co-operation on Justice initiatives.
- 1c. That the Corrections Service Division be moved to the Department of Justice, and a regional Justice staff presence be developed.

NEED #2. There is a need for increases in the allocation of fiscal resources and staffing to the Corrections Service Division.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2a. That the Corrections Service Division and the Department of Justice develop a strategy to better inform the Government of the Northwest Territories about the correctional service delivery system and the need for increased resources.

NEED #3. There is a need for increased training, professional development, and support for staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 3a. That resources be allocated to staff training and professional development and that all Corrections staff be made aware of these opportunities.
- 3b. That the Division provide increased continuing support to institutional and field staff.
- 3c. That staff be made aware of, and funded to engage in, professional development opportunities, and that the Division support and advocate staff development, even in cases in which the Division is unable to financially support it.

NEED #4. There is a need to shift the emphasis from high cost custodial services to more cost-effective community corrections.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 4a. That the Corrections Service Division budget be restructured to allow an increased proportion of total expenditures for Community Corrections.
- 4b. That a new position, such as Community Corrections Worker, be developed to assume the caseload currently carried by the Community Social Service Workers, and to improve community corrections service delivery.

NEED #5. There is a need for vastly improved information management: a new system, adequate training, and data control are required.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 5a. That the Corrections Service Division and the Department of Justice define their needs for information management and research, then decide on the most appropriate option: the development of a new system, or the adoption of an existing system.
- 5b. That the new system be implemented with full user consultation.
- 5c. That a comprehensive information management staff training and support program be developed.

NEED #6. There is a need for increased communication within the Corrections Service Division, and with the Justice Department.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6a. That computer networking systems (such as HP Desk) be provided to all staff to facilitate both formal and informal communication.
- 6b. That regular conferences and seminars be held with facility and community corrections staff.
- 6c. That formalized means of information exchange be further developed.

NEED #7. There is a need for enhanced accountability, and a commitment to regionalization of service delivery.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

7a. That the Corrections Service Division develop a clear policy regarding regionalization and develop departmental relationships which maintain accountability at the community and regional level.

NEED #8. There is a need for an increased number of adult secure custody beds, including beds for repatriation of all federally sentenced offenders.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

8a. That negotiations be continued to amend the Exchange of Services Agreement to repatriate all federally sentenced territorial offenders.

8b. That repatriated federal offenders serve their sentences in territorial institutions.

8c. That the required number of beds, or equivalent alternative resources, be developed to meet the projected demand for correctional services.

NEED #9. There is a need for increased institutional and community programming that is appropriate to the educational, cultural and psychosocial needs of the offenders.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 9a. That program initiatives and program development be based on extensive consultation, discussion and consensus within the communities, within the Division, and within the Justice Department.
- 9b. That most programming be developed at the community and regional level to ensure that it is culturally relevant.
- 9c. That all types of programming be increased, with particular emphasis on alcohol and substance abuse, assault and behaviour management, self-esteem, and life skills.
- 9d. That programming be developed to meet the education and skill levels of the offenders.
- 9e. That programming be specifically developed to meet the needs of federal offenders.
- 9f. That community-based alternatives to incarceration be developed.
- 9g. That potential programs be developed and tested as pilot projects.

NEED #10. There is a need to define the roles of the Community Corrections Specialists and the Community Corrections Co-ordinator.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 10a. That the staffing and structure of the Community Corrections component be reviewed and revised.
- 10b. That the role of the Community Corrections Specialists be reviewed and revised.
- 10c. That the role of the Community Corrections Co-ordinator be reviewed and revised.
- 10d. That the need for a regional justice supervisory position be addressed.

NEED #11. There is a need for increased open custody and post-custodial services for adult and young offenders.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 11a. That adult and youth after-care services be expanded to provide support for the transition between incarceration and community reintegration.
- 11b. That young offender open custody be increased.
- 11c. That Community Residential Centres be developed as an alternative to secure custody.

Alternative Service Delivery Models

Two alternative service delivery models have been developed for correctional service delivery. Model A features a similar emphasis as the existing service delivery model; Model B is based on a shift in emphasis from institutional corrections to community corrections.

The total correctional caseload for both models is equal; it is assumed that the total number of offenders admitted into the correctional system will not vary between the two models. The difference between the two models is in the types of dispositions available, and the relative proportion of the caseload projected for each type of disposition.

Overview of Correctional Service Delivery Model A

Model A represents an evolutionary change and "repair" to the existing system. Gaps in service delivery such as inadequate treatment and programs are addressed by allocating more resources to correctional institutions. The recommendations and projections pertaining to increased custodial and community programming, and facility upgrades and expansions, are based on the assumption of a continued emphasis on secure custody correctional service delivery.

This model would continue the current emphasis on "top down" service delivery. Institutional corrections would continue to be the higher priority, with upgraded and expanded secure custody facilities. Additional staffing would be allocated to community corrections, but service delivery and caseloads would remain limited to programs such as probation and parole, community service orders, and fine option programs. Communities would continue to play a limited role as "consumers" of correctional programs and services, and the formalized, top-down structure of community corrections would not be substantially altered from the current approach.

Model A Projected Correctional Caseloads

	1996	2001	2006
Adult secure custody admissions	1,128	1,248	1,376
Adult open custody admissions	0	0	0
Adult non-custodial caseload	564	624	688
Federal non-custodial caseload	50	50	50
Youth secure custody admissions	65	69	74
Youth open custody admissions	65	69	73
Youth non-custodial caseload	301	322	341
TOTAL CASELOAD	2,173	2,382	2,602

Model A has a higher number of secure custody admissions than Model B because there are no open custody admissions, and because non-custodial dispositions are projected to be a lower proportion of the total caseload than for Model B. The projected caseloads are based on the existing caseloads, as Model A represents a continuation of the current patterns of correctional service delivery. (All caseload calculations are shown in Appendix N.)

For Model A existing secure facilities would be upgraded and expanded to provide a more appropriate physical environment. Facility operating capacities would not exceed the design capacities. Additional beds would be constructed by expanding existing facilities and developing a new facility which would further enhance the regional distribution of correctional centres. Existing staffing levels would be retained but the operating capacities reduced, resulting in an improved staff:inmate ratio. Additional funding and staffing would be allocated to institutional programming.

All federal offenders would be repatriated and would serve at regional facilities which would provide greater proximity to their home communities, and a more culturally appropriate environment.

A total of 278 new adult secure beds would be added to the system by the year 2006, for a total adult secure capacity of 521 beds. This includes 100 beds for federal offenders. At Baffin Correctional Centre 110 beds would be added (50 for territorial offenders, and 60 for federal offenders) for a total capacity of 153 beds. A new secure female facility with nine beds would be constructed in Iqaluit by 2006, for a total adult female secure custody capacity of 19 beds. At Yellowknife Correctional Centre, 28 beds would be added for a total capacity of 169 beds. South Mackenzie Correctional Centre would have an additional 39 beds for a total capacity of 97 beds. A new facility would be developed in Inuvik to provide 92 beds (52 territorial beds and 40 federal beds).

No adult open custody beds would be constructed.

No additional youth secure custody beds would be required, because the secure custody facilities are operating below capacity. Existing secure custody facilities would be upgraded to provide adequate space to provide a more appropriate physical environment for the youth. On-site indoor active recreation space would be a priority at all facilities.

No additional youth open custody beds would be constructed as the beds would continue to be provided on a per diem basis, as is currently the case, when the demand exceeds the capacity of the existing facilities. These per diem beds would include family setting type foster homes and bush camps, in addition to the existing open custody facilities.

The community corrections component would be significantly enhanced, with two new dedicated positions, and improved functioning of the Community Corrections Specialists positions. There would be field staff with an exclusively correctional workload to maintain the work at the community level; the Community Corrections Specialists would also maintain an exclusively corrections workload; and a new regional justice

supervisory position would provide supervision and functional liaison at the regional level between all components of the justice and correctional system.

Community corrections staff would include eight regional justice supervisory positions (Baffin, Inuvik, Keewatin, Kitikmeot, Yellowknife, Rae-Edzo, Fort Simpson, Fort Smith), eight Community Corrections Specialist positions (Baffin, Inuvik, Keewatin, Kitikmeot, Yellowknife, Rae-Edzo, Fort Simpson, Fort Smith), and 29 Community Corrections Worker positions, increasing to 34 by 2006.

Model A provides staffing and funding to meet the objectives of secure custody incarceration in adequate and appropriate facilities, with improved institutional programming, and better staffing; and a comprehensive and integrated community corrections component as a complement to the primary emphasis on secure custody.

Overview of Correctional Service Delivery Model B

Model B represents a significant shift in approach for justice and correctional service delivery. For this model, the emphasis shifts to a "bottom up" community development orientation and a strong emphasis on community corrections. Justice and correctional service delivery are intrinsically linked and are administered as a continuum. The emphasis on community corrections will include intermediate sanctions as alternatives to incarceration, treatment programs, regionally distributed open custody beds for youth and adults, and an holistic, preventive approach to justice and corrections which attempts to address the needs of the offender, the victim, and the community. Secure custody will be used where circumstances justify it. This model will evolve through an incremental community development process, with important parts of the timetable being set by communities. They will not all develop the necessary base to assume correctional roles at the same speed, therefore this model will require more time to implement in its entirety.

Model B provides more options for dispositions, and projects a lower proportion of adult and youth secure custody dispositions.

Model B Projected Correctional Caseloads

	1996	2001	2006
Adult secure custody admissions	733	811	894
Adult open custody admissions	181	200	220
Adult non-custodial caseload	778	861	950
Federal non-custodial caseload	50	50	50
Youth secure custody admissions	44	46	49
Youth open custody admissions	43	46	49
Youth non-custodial caseload	344	368	390
TOTAL CASELOAD	2,173	2,382	2,602

The projected number of adult secure custody admissions for Model B is 35% lower than the projected number for Model A. 16% of the admissions are projected as the open custody caseload, and the non-custodial caseload is projected to be 19% higher than the non-custodial caseload for Model A. The youth non-custodial caseload is projected to be 10% higher for Model B than Model A, and both the open and secure custody caseloads are projected to be 5% lower. The differences between the two models in bedloads, staffing, and component funding allocations reflects the different types of projected caseloads. Model B therefore has more community corrections staff and more funding for community programs and services, whereas Model A has a higher proportion of operating funds and staffing allocated to secure custody.

As with Model A, for Model B existing secure facilities would be upgraded and expanded to provide a more appropriate physical environment. Facility operating capacities would not exceed the design capacities. Additional beds would be constructed by expanding existing facilities and developing a new facility which would further enhance the regional distribution of correctional centres. However, there is proportionately less increase of secure custody beds, as it is projected that some of the demand will be redirected into open custody beds and non-custodial sanctions. Additional funding and staffing would be allocated to institutional programming.

For Model B a total of 131 new adult secure beds would be added to the system by the year 2006, for a total adult secure capacity of 374 beds. This includes 100 beds for federal offenders. At Baffin Correctional Centre 76 beds would be added (16 for territorial offenders, and 60 for federal offenders) for a total capacity of 119 beds. No beds would be added to Yellowknife Correctional Centre or to South Mackenzie Correctional Centre; the capacities of these facilities would be 132, and 58, respectively. A new facility would be developed in Inuvik to provide 55 beds (15 territorial beds and 40 federal beds). No additional secure beds for female offenders would be constructed; therefore the total secure capacity for adult females will continue to be 10 beds.

For federal offenders, the objective would be repatriation to the greatest extent feasible. To achieve this, it would be necessary to upgrade the existing secure custody facilities so that federal offenders could be safely contained. Regional facilities would provide these offenders with greater proximity to their home communities, and a more culturally appropriate environment relative to the federal facilities where they are currently held.

A total of 67 adult community beds would be constructed: 23 in Fort Smith region, six in Kitikmeot or Keewatin region, 28 in Baffin region, and 10 in Inuvik region. These beds would include a ten bed Community Residential Centre for women in Iqaluit, as an alternative to the proposed secure custody centre proposed in Model A.

No additional youth secure custody beds would be required, because the secure custody facilities are operating below capacity. As with Model A, existing secure custody facilities would be upgraded to provide adequate space to provide a more appropriate physical environment for the youth. On-site indoor active recreation space would be a priority at all facilities.

18 additional youth open custody beds would be constructed: six in Baffin region, six in Fort Smith region, three in Inuvik region, and three in either Kitikmeot or Keewatin region. These beds would all be operated on a contract basis, in facilities owned by the Government of the Northwest Territories, and would be in addition to existing and future per diem beds such as bush camps and foster homes.

The community corrections component would be the most strongly emphasized component of the system, and would be significantly improved and modified. The proportion of funding allocated to community-based programming would be approximately five times greater than the proportion currently allocated, and than the proportion allocated under Model A. Implementation of the specific recommendations of this report would result in a different approach to community participation in correctional and justice functions, and increased staffing would provide the necessary support for meaningful community sanctions, and for long term community development.

As with Model A, community corrections staffing would be significantly enhanced, with two new dedicated positions, and improved functioning of the Community Corrections Specialists positions. There would be field staff with an exclusively correctional workload to maintain the work at the community level; the Community Corrections Specialists would also maintain an exclusively corrections workload; and a new regional justice supervisory position would provide a functional liaison at the regional level between all components of the justice and correctional system.

Community corrections staff would include eight regional justice supervisory positions (Baffin, Keewatin, Kitikmeot, Inuvik, Fort Smith, Fort Simpson, Yellowknife, Rae-Edzo), eight (Baffin, Keewatin, Kitikmeot, Inuvik, Fort Smith, Fort Simpson, Yellowknife, Rae-Edzo) Community Corrections Specialist positions (increasing to 12 by 2006), and 36 Community Corrections Worker positions, increasing to 44 by 2006.

Model B provides staffing and funding to improve existing secure facilities and provide adequate and appropriate institutional programming, and projects some expansion of the existing secure custody system. However, Model B differs significantly from Model A in that it is assumed that 35% of all offenders now incarcerated will be diverted into open custody (16%) or to non-custodial sanctions (19%). Therefore a greater proportion of resources have been allocated to community corrections in order to meet this increasing demand for services.

The community corrections component will provide an alternative, as well as complement, to the institutional component of the correctional system. In order to successfully develop Model B, it will be necessary to implement many of the specific recommendations of this report, particularly those pertaining to organizational structure, programming, and accountability. A localized, "bottom-up" structure that is supported by all members of the correctional and judicial system will be the fundamental foundation of this system.

Summary Comparison of Model A and Model B

Places	Model A		Model B	
	new beds	total beds	new beds	total beds
YCC (132)	28	160	0	132
SMCC (58)	39	97	0	58
BCC (43)	50	93	16	59
BCC (federal)	60	60	60	60
TWCC (10)	0	10	0	10
IQALUIT (0)	9	9	0	0
INUVIK (0)	52	52	15	15
INUVIK (federal)	40	40	40	40
Adult Open Custody (0)	0	0	67	67
Youth Secure Custody (46)	0	46	0	46
Youth Open Custody (23)	0	23	18	41
Secure Beds (289)	278	567	85	420
Open Beds (23)	0	23	131	108
Total Beds	278	590	216	528
Institutional Staffing				
existing adult	.50 operating/ .58 design		.50 operating/ .58 design	
projected adult	.66 staff/inmate		.66 staff/inmate	
existing youth	1.6 staff/youth		1.6 staff/youth	
projected youth	1.5 staff/youth		1.5 staff/youth	
Institutional Programs	increased funding		increased funding	
Community Staffing	increased from 12 PY's to 50 PY's		increased from 12 PY's to 64 PY's	
Community Programs	funding continued at current level		funding increased	

Services and Operating Costs - Model A and Model B

For Model A, there is proportionately more money for institutional programs because the majority of offenders are incarcerated. For Model B, there is proportionately more money for community programs and services because it is projected that offenders in open custody or on probation will require community programs and services.

If Model B is adopted, there must be greatly increased expenditures for community programs in order to provide adequate community alternatives to secure custody incarceration.

The projected cost of the Community Programs and Services for Model B should be regarded as a symbolic amount. It represents the actual cost of community programs and services, plus the total difference in the operating costs for all the other components of the two models. As this figure indicates, with Model B, more than five times more funding would be available for community programs and services, assuming that the operating costs of both models were equal. If the allocated amount is more than is needed to implement the recommendations regarding community corrections, then the figure represents potentially lower operating costs of Model B than Model A. However, it is critical that there be recognition that the successful implementation of Model B will depend on greatly increased funding and staffing of community corrections, relative to the current levels.

For both models, the cost of federal beds is nil. All capital and operating costs for federal beds are assumed to be paid by the federal government, under the Exchange of Services Agreement. Repatriation of federal offenders is regarded in the cost analysis as a net zero cost to the territorial government, as federal offenders are the responsibility of the federal government.

As a comparison, the total 1996 operating budget of \$39,656,662 is \$15,772,000 (66%) higher than it would be if it were equivalent to the 1991 budget and adjusted for 5% annual inflation. The largest factor in the increased cost is custodial staffing. The staffing ratio used for the projections is 0.66 staff per offender. The current staffing level, based on operating capacity, is 0.50, and is 0.58 based on design capacity. There are also an additional 53 adult secure custody beds by 1996. Additional funding (\$1.4 or \$2.1 million) has been allocated to funding for institutional programs. For Model B, there are 55 adult open custody and 18 additional youth open custody beds by 1996. For both models, there has been a substantial increase in community staff positions: eight new regional justice supervisory positions; and between 29 and 36 new Community Corrections Worker positions in 1996.

Operating Costs 1996, 2001, 2006

OPERATING COSTS	Model A			Model B		
	# of beds or cases	cost/bed	total cost	# of beds or cases	cost/bed	total cost
Adult Secure Beds	345	\$69,185	\$23,868,711	224	\$69,185	\$15,497,366
Federal Beds	100	\$0	\$0	100	\$0	\$0
Adult Community Beds	0	\$0	\$0	55	\$82,958	\$4,562,690
Youth Secure Beds	46	\$110,050	\$5,062,297	46	\$110,050	\$5,062,297
Youth Open Custody Beds	23	\$85,178	\$1,959,088	41	\$85,178	\$3,492,288
Purchased Youth Placements			\$1,023,578			\$511,789
Community Corrections Workers 29 (A) or 36 (B) positions	864 cases		\$1,814,929	1,103 cases		\$2,253,015
Community Corrections Program Support 8 Specialist positions			\$827,030			\$827,030
Regional justice supervisory position 8 positions			\$1,355,840			\$1,355,840
Institutional Programs			\$2,100,061			\$1,450,170
Community Programs and Services			\$778,532			\$4,289,370
Administration			\$866,595			\$866,595
Total Costs 1996			\$39,656,662			\$39,656,662
Total Costs 2001			\$53,437,128			\$53,437,128
Total Costs 2006			\$74,335,927			\$74,335,927

Summary of Construction Costs

The cost calculations for upgrading the existing facilities have been based on standard areas per inmate (75m² for adult secure custody, and 90m² for youth secure custody, see Appendix P), and on general estimates of construction costs (Appendix S). The area deficiencies calculated on the basis of these standards should be considered as maximum estimates of additional area requirements. The costs of expansions to the facilities are based on the costs of new construction since in most cases, they are of sufficient scale. In some cases, the costs may be higher than projected, but the costs should average out to be equal to the costs of new construction given the total areas. The projected costs for all the facilities except Yellowknife Correctional Centre are for the construction of the additional space required, and do not include the costs of any upgrading which may be required to the existing structure. An estimate has been provided for upgrading the existing area in addition to the cost of expansion based on the current number of beds, and, for Option A, the cost of construction for additional beds.

All capital cost projections include 5% annual inflation. The construction costs vary by location and type of construction. Some of the secure custodial facilities (shown with an *) are of a lower security level of construction, and for these, it has been assumed that additional construction would be consistent with the existing structure.

Construction Costs - Model A

	# of inmates	m2 per inmate or total	cost/m2 (1991 \$)	1991-96 (1996 \$)	1997-2001 (2001 \$)	2002-06 (2006 \$)
Baffin Region						
BCC Upgrade	43	1,829	\$6,660	\$15,547,414		
Isumaqsunnigtut upgrade	12	387	\$6,660	\$3,286,114		
New BCC Beds	50	75	\$6,660	\$31,875,132		
New Female Secure Custody	9	75	\$3,090			\$4,336,124
Fort Smith Region						
YCC Upgrade		4,018	\$4,690	\$24,050,786		
YCC Expansion	132	5,882	\$4,690	\$35,210,638		
SMCC Expansion	58	2,833	\$4,596	\$16,618,956		
TWCC Expansion	10	251	\$2,198	\$704,683		
Hay River Expansion*	20	1,230	\$2,132	\$3,345,509		
River Ridge Expansion*	14	575	\$2,198	\$1,613,309		
New YCC Beds	28	75	\$4,690		\$16,042,983	
New SMCC Beds	39	75	\$4,596			\$27,947,655
Inuvik Region						
New Adult Secure Custody	52	75	\$5,862	\$29,178,094		
Keewatin Region no construction						
Kitikmeot Region no construction						
Construction Costs per Five Year Phase**				\$161,430,635	\$16,042,983	\$32,283,780
				1991-96 Phase	97-2001 Phase	2002-06 Phase
* Open custody construction costs have been used to calculate construction costs for these facilities						
** Costs include consultants' fees, furniture, and project management. Do not include cost of land.						

Construction Costs - Model B

	# of inmates	m2 per inmate or total	cost/m2 (1991 \$)	1991-96 (1996 \$)	1997-2001 (2001 \$)	2002-06 (2006 \$)
Baffin Region						
BCC Upgrade	43	1,829	\$6,660	\$15,547,414		
Isumaqsunnigtut Upgrade	12	387	\$6,660	\$3,286,114		
New BCC Beds	16	75	\$6,660			\$16,614,794
New Adult Open Custody	28	60	\$3,090	\$5,205,697	\$1,811,982	
New Youth Open Custody	6	60	\$3,090	\$1,419,736		
Fort Smith Region						
YCC Upgrade		4,018	\$4,690	\$24,050,786		
YCC Expansion	132	5,882	\$4,690	\$35,210,638		
SMCC Expansion	58	2,833	\$4,596	\$16,618,956		
TWCC Expansion	10	251	\$2,198	\$704,683		
Hay River Expansion*	20	1,230	\$2,132	\$3,345,509		
River Ridge Expansion*	14	575	\$2,198	\$1,613,309		
New Adult Open Custody Beds:						
Yellowknife	9	60	\$2,176	\$1,499,682		
Hay River	8	60	\$2,132	\$1,306,095		
Fort Smith	6	60	\$2,198			\$1,645,014
New Youth Open Custody	6	60	\$2,198	\$1,009,896		
Inuvik Region						
New Adult Secure Custody	15	75	\$5,862	\$8,416,758		
New Adult Open Custody	10	60	\$2,720	\$2,082,892		
New Youth Open Custody	3	60	\$2,720	\$624,867		
Keewatin Region						
New Adult Open Custody	6	60	\$3,220	\$1,479,466		
New Youth Open Custody	3	60	\$3,220	\$739,733		
Kitikmeot Region no construction						
Construction Costs per Five Year Phase**				\$124,162,231	\$1,811,982	\$18,259,808
				1991-96 Phase	97-2001 Phase	2002-06 Phase
* Open custody construction costs have been used to calculate construction costs for these facilities						
** Construction costs include consultants' fees, furniture, and project management. Do not include cost of land.						

Summary and Recommendations

It is our recommendation that Model B be adopted in planning for future correctional service delivery in the Northwest Territories. Within the socioeconomic and cultural context of the North, Model B, with its strong emphasis on community development, is the correctional service delivery model which is most appropriate to the needs and aspirations of the people.

APRA's research and consultation with the communities in the North has indicated that the present approach to justice and correctional service delivery does not meet the needs of offenders and communities, and is in many cases culturally inappropriate. There is widespread support in the communities for the type of service delivery system which is proposed with Model B.

Model B is the recommended model for several reasons, which are outlined below:

1. consultation with the communities indicates a need for, and interest in, this type of model;
2. Model B is a more cost-effective alternative to large, high cost custodial correctional centres;
3. the lower capital and operating costs of facilities in Model B mean that a greater proportion of the money can be spent more effectively on treatment programs based in communities;
4. this model is more appropriate to emerging government policy favouring regionalized and community-based service delivery;
5. it is axiomatic in corrections that offenders should be held or treated in the least restrictive environment that nevertheless protects public safety. Model B directs the lowest security risks to non-custodial programs.
6. this is the most appropriate model for any potential reduction of the incarceration rate, because of the emphasis on programming and breaking the cycle of crime.

In order to successfully implement community corrections as alternatives, rather than supplements to incarceration, the court and the judiciary must be committed to the use of such sanctions as alternatives, and sentencing must reflect that commitment. The successful use of community corrections as an alternative to incarceration will require the constant commitment and support of the justice and correctional system.

In the North, incarceration is unique in that institutional service delivery is far more expensive than in other jurisdictions; furthermore incarceration is not widely viewed as a deterrent. Communities do not support institutional corrections except in cases of serious recidivism, and there is consensus that incarceration offers a comfortable respite for the offender. "It is fundamental to the Canadian system of justice that deprivation of liberty is the most serious sanction that can be applied. In practice, for people whose lives involve struggles with a severe climate, or with unemployment and boredom, a period of time spent in a facility that features warm shelter, regular meals, plentiful companionship, and recreational activities, may not seem such a major punishment. Loss of respect or ostracism within a small home community may be much more meaningful." (Department of Justice, July, 1991:10).

Ole Ingstrup, the Commissioner of the Correctional Service of Canada, argues that "the size of the corrections system has little impact on the rate of crime... we should take a minimalist approach to the use of incarceration to reinforce the importance of each community developing strategies, services and programs to deal with its citizens. Concerted efforts should be made to bring to a conscious level... the idea that maybe they are asking for the wrong things when they ask for longer sentences and more prisons. Resources could be more economically and effectively used in the community to prevent crime and thus protect society." (Proceedings of the Symposium on the Future of Corrections, June 1991:65).

Model B represents a major shift from an institutional correctional system to a community-based correctional system. The most critical elements of success will include a commitment to a "bottom-up" community-based and regionalized correctional program service delivery structure; accountability at the community and regional level; adequate consultation and co-operation with communities, within the Corrections Service Division, and within the Department of Justice; adequate funding and staffing of community programs and services; and the support and commitment of the judicial system.

Model B represents an opportunity for justice and corrections to develop a clear role within communities and to contribute to community development. The holistic, treatment oriented approach will potentially provide the most appropriate and effective forms of justice and corrections for offenders, for victims, and for the communities.

MODEL A Advantages

- more conducive to standardization
- faster and easier implementation
- greater consistency with present system
- less risky because it provides more high security

MODEL A Disadvantages

- less cost-effective model for treatment and rehabilitation
- less appropriate to needs and interests of communities
- less likely to reduce crime and recidivism
- more limited opportunities for programming and treatment

MODEL B Advantages

- more cost effective model for treatment and rehabilitation
- more appropriate to needs and interests of communities
- increased sentencing options for courts
- more appropriate for an holistic, integrated approach to justice and corrections
- offenders held in or near home communities, and in the least restrictive appropriate environment
- better support for existing community corrections initiatives

MODEL B Disadvantages

- less conducive to standardization
- slower and more difficult to implement
- more risky because it provides less high security
- more vulnerable to withdrawals of resource funding

MODEL B IS THE RECOMMENDED OPTION

